

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 FRANK PATRICK BIRCH JR.,

4 Plaintiff

Case No. 2:19-cv-01338-GMN-DJA

ORDER

5 v.

6 STATE OF NEVADA et al.,

7 Defendants
8

9 **I. DISCUSSION**

10 On August 6, 2019, this Court denied Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma*
11 *pauperis* without prejudice because it was incomplete and directed Plaintiff to file a fully
12 complete application. (ECF No. 4 at 2). On August 30, 2019, Plaintiff filed a motion for
13 reconsideration of that previous order (ECF No. 5) and submitted an application to
14 proceed *in forma pauperis* on an appellate court form (ECF No. 6). That same day,
15 Plaintiff also filed a motion to extend copy work limit. (ECF No. 7). On October 21, 2019,
16 Plaintiff filed a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* on this Court's
17 approved form. (ECF No. 8).

18 The Court denies the motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 5) and the application
19 to proceed *in forma pauperis* on the appellate court form (ECF No. 6) as moot because
20 Plaintiff filed a fully complete application on this Court's approved form. The Court also
21 denies the motion for extension of copy work (ECF No. 7) without prejudice at this time
22 because this case is in the pre-service stage and is awaiting screening.

23 The Court will screen Plaintiff's complaint (ECF Nos. 1-1, 1-2, 1-3) and address
24 the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 8) in a separate order.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

It is further ordered that the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 6) is denied as moot.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28